

## THEORY AND RESEARCH ON METROPOLITAN POLITICAL LEADERSHIP: REPORT ON A CONFERENCE

by David B. Truman

INCREASED attention to the governmental problems of cities and metropolitan areas in recent years has resulted in a large volume of descriptive and prescriptive literature. Inevitably, perhaps, much research in this field has proceeded without benefit of explicit theory and without concern for possible contributions to political theory. Yet a number of conceptual or theoretical concerns are common to those undertakings, whatever their aims, most notably the conceptual problems involved in understanding and explaining patterns of political leadership. Whether the immediate objective has been the formulation of new structures of metropolitan organization, the retrospective analysis of mortality among such proposals, or the description of the operating political systems of various types of urban community, the question of how public decisions are made in and for such areas has made its appearance, sooner or later, openly or in partial disguise. Hence it becomes appropriate, if not imperative, to inquire what kinds of conceptual frameworks are available for the analysis of leadership in urban settings. What are their capacities and limitations? How may they be extended?

To explore such questions as these and to encourage explicit attempts to deal with them, the Council's Committee on Political Behavior,<sup>1</sup> in cooperation with the Center for Metropolitan Studies at Northwestern University and the Ford Foundation project for studying

metropolitan reform movements, held a conference at Northwestern on April 1-3, 1960. The thirty persons invited to participate included theoreticians and "practitioners" and represented not only political science and sociology, but also the law and journalism.<sup>2</sup> Papers, circulated in advance of the meetings, were prepared by Peter H. Rossi, "Theory and Method in the Study of Power in the Local Community"; Robert A. Dahl, "Leadership in a Fragmented Political System: Notes for a Theory"; Herbert Kaufman, "Metropolitan Leadership: The Snark of the Social Sciences"; and Norton E. Long, "Some Observations Towards a Natural History of Metropolitan Politics." Each of these contributions was the subject of a session of the conference; and a fifth session was devoted to general discussion aimed at identifying points of convergence or disagreement and questions deserving future exploration.

<sup>2</sup> In addition to Messrs. Dahl, Levi, McKean, Truman, and Wood, the participants in the conference were Ross C. Beiler, University of Miami; Frederic N. Cleaveland, University of North Carolina; Matthew Cullen, Ford Foundation; Allison Dunham, University of Chicago Law School; Daniel R. Grant, Vanderbilt University; Scott Greer, Northwestern University; Charles M. Haar, Harvard Law School; Herbert Kaufman, Yale University; Maurice Klain, Western Reserve University; Christian L. Larsen, Sacramento State College; Norton E. Long, Northwestern University; Samuel Lubell, Columbia School of Journalism; Frank Munger, Syracuse University; J. A. Norton, Cleveland Metropolitan Services Commission, Western Reserve University; Nelson W. Polsby, Brookings Institution, now of the University of Wisconsin; Peter H. Rossi, University of Chicago; Wallace S. Sayre, Columbia University; Henry J. Schmandt, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee; George A. Shipman, University of Washington; York Willbern, Indiana University; James Q. Wilson, University of Chicago; Robert C. Wood, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; G. Coleman Woodbury, University of Wisconsin.

<sup>1</sup> The members of the committee in 1959-60 were David B. Truman, Columbia University (chairman); William M. Beaney, Princeton University; Robert A. Dahl, Yale University; Oliver Garceau and V. O. Key, Jr., Harvard University; Avery Leiserson, Vanderbilt University; Edward H. Levi, University of Chicago; Dayton D. McKean, University of Colorado; staff, Bryce Wood.

## SOCIOMETRIC STUDIES OF POWER IN THE COMMUNITY

Space does not permit more than suggestions of the highlights of the papers, especially those points on which the discussion focused. Concentrating first on research technique, Rossi reviewed existing studies of power structure under three main headings: first, studies in which a sample of the adult population of the community is asked to designate its most influential citizens ("mass sociometry"); second, studies in which individuals, selected because their positions are assumed to provide them with especially relevant knowledge, are asked to designate persons or organizations holding power in the community ("elite sociometry"); and, third, studies in which individuals whose positions have involved them in a decision on a public issue are asked to identify persons who influenced the nature of the decision ("decision sociometry"). Noting that the first of these techniques is useful primarily in studying small towns or restricted urban neighborhoods, Rossi gave most attention to the second and third. Here he argued that "elite sociometry," typified by the work of Hunter,<sup>3</sup> is the more systematic, although it suffers the limitations of identifying only a potential structure and in some instances the unnecessary handicap of concentrating on the politics of civic committees and voluntary associations to the virtual exclusion of governmental processes. "Decision sociometry," on the other hand, is more productive of insights into processes of leadership, but tends to produce case studies that are qualitative in character, resistant to generalization, and low in comparability. Suggesting that these limitations might be reduced, he argued in effect for the complementarity of the two techniques. "Actual influence," he noted, "is potential influence modified by opportunity, interest, and decision-making machinery."

Turning to questions of theory, Rossi suggested that variations in phenomena associated with governmental agencies and officials and in phenomena related to the electorate, organized to some degree in parties and other political associations, independently influence the type of power structure in the community. He identified three broad types of community power structure—the "monolithic," in turn divisible into either highly centralized or caucus rule by the few; the "polythetic," characterized by bargaining among separate power structures and by professional political control of local government; and a residual "amorphous" type showing no enduring pattern of power. His conception of the relation between the indicators of electoral and official phenomena and these types is shown in the following general proposi-

tion: In (presumably large and heterogeneous) communities with well-developed political parties, whose officials are normally full-time, where party lines tend to follow class and ethnic lines, and where the party favored by the lower status groups has a good chance of electing candidates to local office, the community power structure tends to be polythetic rather than monolithic.

## URBAN POLITICAL LEADERSHIP

Dahl's paper was a formal analytical statement abstracted from the materials of his recently completed research on community leadership in New Haven.<sup>4</sup> After discussing some empirical difficulties in the measurement of influence, he suggested that the key variables to be taken into account in judging relative influence are the rate and the efficiency with which "actors" use available "influence resources." Such resources include any means of granting rewards to or imposing deprivations upon participants in the political system, any means of affecting the expectations or cognitions of participants, and any differentially distributed opportunities for employing these. Thus, for example, money, control of jobs, and the right to vote are resources, as are legitimate authority, control of information, and high social status. But in addition the time and energy to use these and other means are themselves resources.

The complexity and functional specialization of institutions in the contemporary community have resulted in a fragmented distribution of influence resources. Hence, in Dahl's view, the general pattern of influence in a city of any considerable size will be either one in which a number of individuals or small groups have their own spheres of influence—in his terms, "independent sovereignties"—or one in which several leaders with diverging goals and strategies act in coalition.

Any tendency toward a high degree of influence over most or all sectors of community policy, Dahl suggested, is likely to be associated with the group of elected public officials who have ample resources and the skill and incentives to use them copiously and efficiently. The tendency toward a concentration of influence, wherever it may occur, reflects the disposition of all groups to use their resources relatively sparingly in the sphere of public policy, and thus for those few who employ them more frequently and fully to be especially influential. Coalitions of elite "chieftains," in Dahl's view, may appear when these leaders feel the need for a degree of coordination not supplied by their "independent sover-

<sup>3</sup> Floyd Hunter, *Community Power Structure: A Study of Decision Makers* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953).

<sup>4</sup> His report on this project, which was carried out with the aid of the Committee on Political Behavior under its program of Grants for Research on American Governmental Processes, will be published by Yale University Press in the fall of 1961, as *Power and Democracy*.

eignities"; but such coalitions are not likely to develop without a "political entrepreneur" as coalition builder. For this role the chief elected executive is the expected candidate. Under appropriate conditions such a coalition may develop into a persisting executive-centered order, a coalition of coalitions in which the elected chief executive is the only individual of high influence in all the groups.

## METROPOLITAN POLITICS

Kaufman's paper discussed the analytical scheme—a map rather than a model—that he and Wallace Sayre had developed for their study of the politics of New York City.<sup>5</sup> Deliberately seeking a conception that would not assume the existence of an integrated ruling elite, they chose to view the system as a contest for the stakes of office, money, service, and ideological or other intangible rewards, in which the contestants—party leaders, public officials, the city bureaucracies, nongovernmental groups, the communication media, officials of other governments on the same or "higher" levels, and the electorate—operate within a set of formal and informal rules. A central focus thus is the strategies available to and used by the contestants. Finding this a useful scheme for giving coherent meaning to the politics of the central city, Kaufman urged its adaptability to research on emergent and proposed governmental arrangements spanning a whole metropolitan area.

Long's paper, like Kaufman's less explicitly theoretical than the first two, was primarily an analysis of recent attempts at governmental innovation in the St. Louis, Cleveland, and Miami metropolitan areas. Long suggested that the innovating process in local government had become highly standardized, with semiritualistic features that are often dysfunctional for adaptation to the changing demands upon metropolitan governments. Thus the assumption of a conflict-free local politics that is customarily a part of the "study by experts" phase of attempts at innovation interferes, according to Long, with the political effectiveness of the recommendations. This phase, moreover, is often poorly articulated with the customary second stage, the appointment of "notables" to a commission on reform of the charter. These persons often have no clear conception of what is called for or of the conditions limiting their efforts. Finally, at the referendum stage, when that is required, the common experience is a breakdown of communication between the "notables" and the electorate. This in turn seems to reflect a lack of elite consensus and integrated strategy, failure accurately to assess the threat of

innovation to existing subsystems, and electoral appeals that are largely ignorant of the causal factors affecting the behavior of voters in this particular situation. Long offered these as preliminary interpretations and appealed for the development of more systematic theory concerning the conditions under which a political community can emerge at such subnational levels as the metropolitan area.

## SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Discussion of the points raised or suggested by the papers ranged widely. Despite numerous disagreements, the sessions reflected a tacit acceptance of the importance of exploiting convergences in theory, of avoiding sterile arguments of a definitional character, and of exploring certain critical problems concerning which the level of knowledge appears to be unnecessarily low. At the technical level the most conspicuous disagreements dealt with "elite sociometry," to use Rossi's term, and especially with the work of Hunter. The point in controversy was whether the ascriptive features of this technique are complementary to the technique of "decision sociometry" or are incompatible with it. Though this issue was joined, it was not resolved. Critics were disposed to view the apparent reliability of the former technique as meaningless and to regard its findings entirely as artifacts of the procedure. Defenders regarded the reliability as genuine and the findings as representing a kind of structure, a potential power, that can be said to exist in reality. Not inclined to unqualified approval of the technique, however, its defenders proposed modifications in it, in order to reduce the reliance on attribution and to exploit the relative ease of replication that it allegedly permits. The more skeptical regarded this as an admission that the technique did no more than indicate something about the distribution of a particular power resource, namely, status or esteem.

There was general agreement among the participants that the contemporary American setting fosters a fragmented distribution of power resources and that, with some exceptions, if any integrated leadership exists, it is likely to be found in the formally elected officials. This, however, could be regarded at most as a tendency dependent on particular kinds of conditions, and divergence in these might permit a focus on a newspaper or some other structure in the community. This line of discussion in turn produced agreement on the importance of increasing comparative research, primarily within the United States but perhaps also in other cultures, aimed at identifying differences in the incidence and distribution of power resources and ascertaining the structural consequences of such differences.

<sup>5</sup> Wallace S. Sayre and Herbert Kaufman, *Governing New York City: Politics in the Metropolis* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1960).



Among the insufficiently explored but critical subjects for research that were identified, three received considerable attention. The first is the influence of ideology—of the way people think about the distribution of power—on the power structure itself. Instances were cited in which a structure apparently shifted quite suddenly from a monolithic to a polyolithic pattern without any evident change in the community except in popular thinking. If ideology in this sense can be an independent variable, it should be dealt with explicitly, as part of a theory of political change. Otherwise we shall not be able to treat relationships between ideology and structure that we cannot satisfactorily explain at the present time and are in danger of ignoring.

Second, there is the problem of coalitions. It was agreed that we know little of a systematic sort about the conditions under which particular kinds of coalitions develop in a community of fragmented power resources, to say nothing of the conditions of their persistence or dissolution. The development of a theory of coalitions that would take account of the types and varieties of

cleavage within the community, including the class and status systems, would constitute an enormous advance, although this is admittedly an extremely difficult problem both conceptually and empirically. Among other points, it was suggested that notions like "independent sovereignties" and other analogies from the international sphere could be misleading if used indiscriminately.

Finally, the apparent gap between initiatives shown by elite groups and electoral responses in the urban setting was nominated for more intensive exploration. Conceivable as a problem in the rate and efficiency of resource use, this was recognized as involving a number of additional variables that are not easily handled empirically. Among those discussed in some measure were variations in the degree to which elites are geographically mobile, the consequences of differing rates of population growth, variations in the legitimacy of innovations by elites as against their potential veto authority in matters of urban and metropolitan government, and variations in the patterns of organization among ethnic, occupational, and similar groups in the community.

## COMMITTEE BRIEFS

### ECONOMIC GROWTH

Simon Kuznets (chairman), Richard Hartshorne, Melville J. Herskovits, Edgar M. Hoover, Bert F. Hoselitz, Wilbert E. Moore, Neil Smelser, Joseph J. Spengler.

Under the committee's auspices, Kazushi Ohkawa, Professor of Economics at the Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo, and Henry Rosovsky, Associate Professor of Economics at the University of California, Berkeley, are to make a two-year study of the long-run development of the Japanese economy, using modern techniques of economic analysis and current theories of economic growth. Funds for the study have been granted to the Council by the Ford Foundation.

In addition to the conferences that have been planned on the economics of Soviet industrialization, which will be held at Princeton University on May 6-8, and on the economics of Sub-Saharan Africa, which will be held at Northwestern University on November 16-18, the committee is exploring the feasibility of conferences on the interrelations of recent demographic and economic trends in developing areas and on the relation of education to economic growth.

The sixth in the series of essays presenting the results of the chairman's comparative studies of economic growth, "Quantitative Aspects of the Economic Growth of Nations: VI. Long-Term Trends in Capital Formation Proportions," will be published as a supplement to the April 1961 issue of *Economic Development and Cultural Change*.

### ECONOMIC STABILITY

R. A. Gordon (chairman), Moses Abramovitz, James S. Duesenberry, Bert G. Hickman, Lawrence R. Klein, David W. Lusher, Geoffrey H. Moore.

The committee, which was appointed in the autumn of 1959 following a conference on research on economic stability held at the University of Michigan in the preceding June, has developed plans for a major project to review critically the work that has been done on the construction of econometric models of the United States and to construct a new system based on diverse schools of economic thought. The project, for which it is hoped that financing can soon be arranged, will involve the collaboration of some 16 or 17 scholars, each of whom will be responsible for specific sectors of the economy or technical aspects of model building. After extensive preliminary work they expect to meet at Dartmouth College for three weeks in August to evaluate their findings and to plan further assignments to be undertaken during the ensuing year, after which a second summer conference will attempt to combine their final results into an integrated model. Over-all coordination of this effort will be provided by Messrs. Klein and Duesenberry.

"A Simulation of the United States Economy in Recession," by Mr. Duesenberry, Otto Eckstein, and Gary Fromm, a revision of their paper prepared for the conference that preceded the committee's appointment, was published in the October 1960 issue of *Econometrica*.

## PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT IN YOUTH

Ralph W. Tyler (chairman), Dana L. Farnsworth, Chester W. Harris, T. R. McConnell, Theodore M. Newcomb, C. Robert Pace, Nevitt Sanford, Robin M. Williams, Jr.; *staff*, Francis H. Palmer.

The workshop on measures of authoritarianism supported by the committee in August 1959 under the chairmanship of George G. Stern of Syracuse University advanced research on identification of factors within the authoritarian concept as originally measured by the California F-Scale. Since that time subscales have been developed and combined into a scale on stereopathy-acquiescence. With further support from the committee, Messrs. Sanford and Stern, Richard Christie of Columbia University, Harold Webster of the University of California, Berkeley, and Hugh Lane of the University of Chicago participated in a second workshop, held at Berkeley in July 1960, for the purpose of editing and modifying scale items on which data had been collected. The present instrument consists of two 200-item forms, each composed of twenty 10-item scales. Mr. Stern is continuing work on validation of the scale, and will prepare a report describing its development.

Messrs. Pace and Stern have completed the first experimental edition of their revised College Characteristics Index, designed to analyze the dynamics of college environments, and Mr. Pace is collecting data with that instrument.

The manuscript summarizing the results of the workshops on peer group cultures in colleges, which were directed by Mr. Newcomb, has been edited by Mr. Newcomb and Everett K. Wilson of Antioch College, and arrangements are being made for its publication.

## POPULATION CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

Dudley Kirk (chairman), Robert W. Burgess, John D. Durand, Ronald Freedman, Daniel O. Price, George J. Stolnitz.

The committee met at the Bureau of the Census on February 23-24 with the prospective contributors to the monographs for which commitments have been made, in order to clarify the scope of the data needed for the studies, to consider tabulation plans, and to deal with possible overlaps between the subjects of the separate monographs. It is

expected that final plans will be completed soon for studies of rural America, historical trends in the education of the American population, personal and family incomes, the place of the Negro in the American population, the American family, significant population changes during the past decade, and the growth and structure of metropolitan communities. Additional studies are under consideration, and the committee is still interested in receiving further suggestions within the next month or two, especially with respect to economic implications of population change.

## SOCIALIZATION AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE

John A. Clausen (chairman), Orville G. Brim, Jr., Ronald Lippitt, Eleanor Maccoby, M. Brewster Smith; *staff*, Francis H. Palmer.

The committee is planning a number of workshops to be held at different universities, for the purpose of surveying the research literature and formulating concepts about specific subjects related to the socialization process. At the University of Michigan, Mr. Lippitt, Daniel Miller, Harold Proshansky, and Martin Gold are meeting regularly to consider schema for studying the relationship between social class as an agent of socialization and child development. Mrs. Maccoby is organizing a group at Stanford University to consider socialization in relation to sex differences, and Mr. Clausen is organizing a group at Berkeley to consider the role of ordinal position. Because the files of research centers and institutes where longitudinal studies of children have been made are believed to contain a great deal of unpublished data relating to child development, the committee has arranged for Jerome Kagan of the Fels Research Institute to visit several such centers during the summer of 1961. He will examine the general approach taken in particular studies, the accessibility of unpublished data, and the extent to which measures and samples are comparable from study to study. Marian Yarrow of the National Institutes of Health is organizing for the committee a conference on observational techniques in studies of child development, to be held late in 1961. The conference will emphasize techniques and methods of observing children in interaction with various socializing agents as well as in the absence of such agents.

## PERSONNEL

### DIRECTORS OF THE COUNCIL

The following persons have been designated by the seven national social science organizations associated with the Council to serve as directors of the Council for the three-year term 1961-63:

Paul Bohannon, Northwestern University, by the American Anthropological Association

George H. Hildebrand, Cornell University, by the American Economic Association

Louis Gottschalk, University of Chicago, by the American Historical Association

J. Roland Pennock, Swarthmore College, by the American Political Science Association

Wayne H. Holtzman, University of Texas, by the American Psychological Association

John A. Clausen, University of California, Berkeley, by the American Sociological Association

Philip J. McCarthy, Cornell University, by the American Statistical Association.

Their credentials as members are scheduled for acceptance by the board of directors of the Council at its spring meeting in New York on March 24-25, 1961.

## FACULTY RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS

The Committee on Faculty Research Fellowships—William H. Nicholls (chairman), John D. Lewis, Gardner Lindzey, Joseph J. Mathews, Richard P. McCormick, and John Useem—held the first of its two meetings scheduled for 1960–61 on December 12–13. It voted to award 24 fellowships, as follows:

Andrew H. Clark, Professor of Geography, University of Wisconsin, for research in Canada and Western Europe on the historical geography of settlement and agriculture in Southeastern Australia and western Cape Province, Union of South Africa.

Sigmund Diamond, Associate Professor of Historical Sociology, Columbia University, for research in England, France, and Spain on the theory of human nature in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

William H. Dunham, Jr., Professor of History, Yale University, for research in England on the Kingdom and the Crown: an analysis and history of certain dominant principles of the British Constitution, 871–1953, their formulation and transmutation.

Richard S. Eckaus, Associate Professor of Economics, Brandeis University, for research in Italy and the Netherlands on the economic characteristics of technologies used in metalworking industries.

Samuel J. Eldersveld, Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan, for research in the Netherlands on the role of political parties in the policy process, group conflict resolution, and the maintenance of consensus in that country.

Charles Fairman, Professor of Law, Harvard University, for research on the history of the U. S. Supreme Court, 1864–88.

William H. Form, Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Michigan State University, for research in Italy on patterns of social integration among industrial workers: a comparative analysis.

Varden Fuller, Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of California, Berkeley, for research in Western Europe on an international comparison of policies and practices governing the size, composition, and utilization of the farm labor force.

Sidney Goldstein, Professor of Sociology, Brown University, for research in the United States and Denmark on the extent and character of repeated migration in the latter country in relation to social and personal disorganization.

Bertram M. Gross, Visiting Professor of Administration, Syracuse University (on leave from The Hebrew University, Jerusalem), for research on a general theory of administration.

Gabriel Jackson, Assistant Professor of History, Wellesley College, for research mainly in Spain on the history of the Spanish Republic and the Civil War, 1931–39 (renewal).

William A. Jenks, Professor of History, Washington and Lee University, for research mainly in Austria on parliamentary democracy in that country, 1907–14.

Solon T. Kimball, Professor of Anthropology and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, for research on the dynamics of process in innovation and change.

Lawrence B. Krause, Assistant Professor of Economics, Yale University, for research in France, Luxembourg, and Switzerland on the effects of European integration on the economy of the United States.

Edwin Kuh, Associate Professor of Finance and Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for research in London and Western Europe on the statistical measurement of dynamic business processes and behavior parameters in large-scale econometric models, with specific application to the short-run determination of income distribution.

Harry Levin, Associate Professor of Child Development and Family Relations, Cornell University, for research in Italy on language acquisition and behavior in young children.

Guenter Lewy, Assistant Professor of Government, Smith College, for research in Germany on the German Catholic church and Nazi totalitarianism: a study in the theory of church and state.

J. Russell Major, Associate Professor of History, Emory University, for research in France on the decline of the French provincial estates in the seventeenth century.

Herbert Marcuse, Professor of Philosophy and Politics, Brandeis University, for research on the ideology of advanced industrial society.

Julius Margolis, Professor of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley, for research in England and other West European countries on economic analysis of public services.

H. Gordon Skilling, Professor of Political Economy, University of Toronto, for research in East European countries on comparative Communism, with special reference to ideology and leadership.

Richard E. Sullivan, Associate Professor of History, Michigan State University, for research in Europe on early Christian monasticism (c. 400–900) to ascertain the impact of this institution as a creative force shaping early West European society.

Hayden V. White, Assistant Professor of History, University of Rochester, for research in Italy on the relation between science and social thought in Italy, 1543–1643.

Perez Zagorin, Assistant Professor of History, McGill University, for research in the United States on the social history of the English Revolution, 1640–60 (supplemental to Faculty Research Grant awarded in 1958–59).

## GRANTS-IN-AID

The Committee on Grants-in-Aid—Vincent H. Whitney (chairman), Paul Bohannon, James M. Buchanan, John Hope Franklin, William H. Riker, and Gordon Wright—held the first of its two meetings scheduled for 1960–61 on December 15–16. It voted to award the following 18 grants-in-aid of research:

Loren Baritz, Assistant Professor of History, Wesleyan University, for research on a history of pessimism in America: an analysis of the tension between national goals and experience.

Otomar J. Bartos, Assistant Professor of Sociology, University of Hawaii, for research designed to test the basic assumption of a model of negotiation.



Thomas S. Berry, Associate Professor of Business Administration, University of Richmond, for research in the United States and England on fluctuations in commodity prices, trade, and banking in the San Francisco area in comparison with New York and London, 1847-1900 (renewal of grant-in-aid awarded in 1957-58).

David D. Bien, Assistant Professor of History, Princeton University, for research in France and Italy on the expulsion of the Jesuits from France during the 1760's.

Margaret G. Davies, Associate Professor of History, Pomona College, for research in England on problems of estate management and income among gentry landholders in Restoration England.

John D. Eyre, Associate Professor of Geography, University of North Carolina, for research in Japan on relationships between Nagoya and its tributary area.

John H. Flavell, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of Rochester, for a critical evaluation of the developmental theory and research of Jean Piaget.

Roland W. Force, Curator of Oceanic Archaeology and Ethnology, Chicago Natural History Museum, for completion in Hawaii of a study of kinship and social organization in the Palau Islands.

John Grant Grumm, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Kansas, for research on factors influencing voting in the Kansas legislature.

Abram L. Harris, Professor of Economics, University of Chicago, for study in England of the dispatches of John Stuart Mill as Examiner, East India Company, and his correspondence with J. E. Cairnes, 1859-66.

C. Warren Hollister, Assistant Professor of History, University of California, Santa Barbara, for research on Anglo-Norman military institutions.

Emmet Larkin, Assistant Professor of History, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for research in Italy and England on the history of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland in the nineteenth century.

Richard Lowitt, Associate Professor of History, Connecticut College, for completion of a study of the process through which George W. Norris emerged as an insurgent leader.

David P. McAllester, Professor of Anthropology, Wesleyan University, for field study on the Navaho reservation of the texts and translations of two Navaho chants.

George L. Mosse, Professor of History, University of Wisconsin, for research in England and Germany on the intellectual origins of national socialism centering upon the "new romanticism" at the turn of the century.

Nelson W. Polsby, Instructor in Political Science, University of Wisconsin, for research on the political theories of makers of national policy in Washington, D.C.

Robert J. Smith, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Cornell University, for research in the United States on the historical development of the Japanese family and kinship terminology.

Bertie Wilkinson, Professor of Medieval History, University of Toronto, for completion in England of a history of the fifteenth century (renewal of Faculty Research Grant awarded in 1956-57).

## GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON AMERICAN GOVERNMENTAL AND LEGAL PROCESSES

The Committee on Political Behavior—David B. Truman (chairman), William M. Beaney, Robert A. Dahl, Oliver Garceau, V. O. Key, Jr., Avery Leiserson, and Edward H. Levi—at its meeting on January 28 awarded 8 grants for research under its program:

Philip E. Converse, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan, for research on a "reinstating" election, 1960.

Homer C. Cooper, Assistant Professor of Social Psychology, Dartmouth College, for research on perceived subgroup dominance and political party affiliation (renewal of grant made in 1958-59).

Yale Kamisar, Professor of Law, University of Minnesota, for research on the criminal law in action: the prosecutor's discretion (renewal).

Roland N. McKean, Research Economist, RAND Corporation, for an economic analysis of governmental problems of choice.

Donald G. Morgan, Professor of Political Science, Mount Holyoke College, for research on the responsibility of Congress for considering constitutional questions and the manner of its exercise (renewal).

Samuel C. Patterson, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Oklahoma State University, for research on the structure and process of political conflict in Oklahoma.

Joseph Tanenhaus, Associate Professor of Government, New York University, for research on aspects of the behavior of the U. S. Supreme Court and its members.

James Q. Wilson, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago, for completion of a comparative study of reform movements in party organizations in three cities (renewal).

## GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY

The Committee on National Security Policy Research—William T. R. Fox (chairman), Charles J. Hitch, Morris Janowitz, Klaus Knorr, G. A. Lincoln, John W. Masland, Robert E. Osgood, Arthur Smithies—at its meeting on January 26 awarded 3 grants for research in its field:

Paul Y. Hammond, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Yale University, for research on interrelations between organization and strategy in national security policy.

Irving B. Holley, Jr., Associate Professor of History, Duke University, for research on General J. MacAuley Palmer and the relationship between the military establishment and the civilians who constituted the army in wartime, 1890-1948 (renewal of grant made in 1954-55).

James R. Schlesinger, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Virginia, for research on professionalism and national security decisions.

## GRANTS FOR AFRICAN STUDIES

The new Joint Committee on African Studies, of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council—William A. Hance (chairman), Elizabeth Colson, William O. Jones, Vernon McKay, Alan P. Merriam, William E. Welmers, and Roland Young—on December 9 made the following 7 grants for research relating to Africa south of the Sahara:

Margaret L. Bates, Professor of History and Political Science, Goddard College, for a survey in Tanganyika of recent political development in that country.

Robert O. Collins, Instructor in History, Williams College, for research in England on British policy in the Southern Sudan.

John F. Due, Professor of Economics, University of Illinois, for research in Africa on the role of taxation in the development of underdeveloped economies, with particular reference to central Africa.

Terence K. Hopkins, Assistant Professor of Sociology, Columbia University, for field study in Uganda of the social structures of indigenous economies.

J. Gus Liebenow, Assistant Professor of Government, Indiana University, for a comparative study in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and England of political and administrative leadership in Liberia and Sierra Leone (supplemental to Faculty Research Fellowship awarded by the Social Science Research Council in 1959-60).

Richard F. Logan, Associate Professor of Geography, University of California, Los Angeles, for research in South West Africa on resource potentials of contrasting regions of that Territory.

R. C. Pratt, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Toronto, for research in England on the development of African local government in East Africa since 1947.

## GRANTS FOR RESEARCH

### ON CONTEMPORARY CHINA

The Joint Committee on Contemporary China of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council—George E. Taylor (chairman), John M. H. Lindbeck (secretary), Alexander Eckstein, John K. Fairbank, Walter Galenson, Norton S. Ginsburg, A. M. Halpern, C. Martin Wilbur, and Hellmut Wilhelm—at its meeting on December 2-3 made its first grants for research, to the following 12 scholars:

John DeFrancis, Associate Professor of Mathematics, Quinnipiac College, for research for three years in preparation of a Chinese mathematics dictionary.

Charles Hoffmann, Assistant Professor of Economics, Queens College, for research on work incentives in the Chinese economy, 1953-60.

Chiao-min Hsieh, Associate Professor of Geography, Catholic University of America, for research in preparation of an atlas of contemporary China.

Joseph M. Kitagawa, Associate Professor of History of Religion, University of Chicago, for research in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Japan on Buddhism in contemporary China, with special reference to the period since 1949.

Shao Chuan Leng, Associate Professor of Foreign Affairs, University of Virginia, for research in Hong Kong and the United States on the legal system of Communist China.

Edwin P. Reubens, Associate Professor of Economics, The City College, New York, for research on the mobilization of underemployed labor in Communist China, and the role of such mobilization in the central planning of economic development.

Anthony M. Tang, Associate Professor of Economics and Business Administration, Vanderbilt University, for research on the economic development of contemporary China, with particular reference to the agricultural sector.

H. Yuan Tien, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, for research in Hong Kong on population policies of Communist China, with special reference to rural-urban distribution and land settlements in border regions.

Tang Tsou, Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago, for research on force and diplomacy in the foreign relations of Communist China.

Y. C. Wang, Visiting Assistant Professor of Far Eastern History, University of Chicago, for research on the impact of Chinese educated abroad on China.

Holmes H. Welch, Consul, American Consulate General, Hong Kong, for research in Hong Kong and Southeast Asia on Buddhist institutions in Communist China.

Yuan-li Wu, Professor of Economics, Marquette University, for research on transportation and spatial economics in Communist China.

## GRANTS FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES

The Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, sponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies—Robert N. Burr (chairman), Henry P. de Vries, Fred P. Ellison, Wendell C. Gordon, Irving A. Leonard, Charles Wagley, and Robert Wauchope—at a meeting on December 16-17 awarded grants for research to the following 12 scholars:

Charles W. Arnade, Interim Assistant Professor of History and Social Sciences, University of Florida, for research on the history of Bolivia.

M. Margaret Ball, Professor of Political Science, Wellesley College, for research in Latin America on the Organization of American States.

Frank Dauster, Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Rutgers University, for research in Mexico and Puerto Rico on their contemporary playwrights.

Rosendo A. Gomez, Associate Professor of Government, University of Arizona, for research in Peru on its political system in a period of change.

Joseph Evans Grimes, Lecturer in Descriptive Linguistics, University of Oklahoma, for research in Mexico on rural Nayarit Spanish.

Fred S. Keller, Professor of Psychology, Columbia University, for experimental research in Brazil on language learning.

John A. Nist, Associate Professor of English and Speech, Eastern Michigan University, for research in Brazil on the aesthetic movement known as *Modernismo*.



Robert A. Potash, Associate Professor of History, University of Massachusetts, for research in Argentina and the United States on Argentine political history since 1930.

Robert E. Quirk, Associate Professor of History, Indiana University, for research in Mexico and the United States on the Mexican Revolution and the Catholic Church, 1910-29.

Robert E. Scott, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Illinois, for research in Peru on the role of interest groups in Peru's political process.

Alfred P. Tischendorf, Assistant Professor of History, Duke University, for research in Argentina and the United States on the Argentine Radical Party, 1916-30.

A. H. Whiteford, Professor of Anthropology, Beloit College, for research in Colombia on cultural change in the Upper Cauca Valley.

#### GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON THE NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

The Joint Committee on the Near and Middle East, sponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies—T. Cuyler Young (chairman), Dankwart A. Rustow (secretary), Hamilton A. R. Gibb, Majid Khadduri, William D. Schorger, Wilfred C. Smith, G. E. von Grunebaum, and John A. Wilson—at a meeting on December 17 awarded 8 grants for research:

Douglas E. Ashford, Assistant Professor of Government, Indiana University, for a comparative analysis in Europe, Morocco, Tunisia, and Pakistan of programs for forced political change in those three countries.

William M. Brinner, Assistant Professor of Near Eastern Languages, University of California, Berkeley, for research in Europe, Cairo, Damascus, and Istanbul on Egypt and Syria during the reign of Mamluk Sul'tan Barqûq (1382-97).

John Gulick, Assistant Professor of Anthropology, University of North Carolina, for research in Lebanon on patterns of urban social organization and cultural processes in that country.

Charles Issawi, Associate Professor of Near and Middle East Economics, Columbia University, for research in Europe and in the Arab countries on their economic history since 1800.

Kemal H. Karpat, Associate Professor of Political Science, Montana State University, for research in Turkey on current political changes there, with special reference to local party organizations, social groups, and values.

Louise E. Sweet, Associate Professor of Anthropology, Indiana State College (Pennsylvania), for archival research in England on traditional culture patterns of the Persian Gulf region.

Martin W. Wilmington, Economist, New York City Department of Commerce, Adjunct Professor of Economics and Geography, Pace College, for research in England, Egypt, Sudan, and Israel on a history of the Middle East Supply Center.

Leon Zolondek, Assistant Professor of Semitic Languages, University of Kentucky, for research in Egypt, Lebanon, and Turkey on the term *Sha'ab* in Arab sociopolitical literature of the last half of the nineteenth century.

#### GRANTS FOR SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES

The Joint Committee on Slavic and East European Grants, sponsored with the American Council of Learned Societies—Evsey D. Domar (chairman), Deming Brown, J. Michael Montias, Henry L. Roberts, and Donald W. Treadgold—at a meeting on January 28 awarded the following 17 grants for research:

Joseph N. Frank, Assistant Professor of English, University of Minnesota, for a study of Dostoevsky's work in relation to Russian cultural history.

David Granick, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin, for research on Soviet economic development in metalworking industries.

Thomas T. Hammond, Associate Professor of History, University of Virginia, for preparation of a bibliography on Soviet foreign relations and world communism, 1917-60.

Jacob B. Hoptner, Assistant Director, Department of Professional Education, National Foundation, for research on the Yugoslav government-in-exile and the diplomatic recognition of the *de facto* Tito government.

W. A. Douglas Jackson, Professor of Geography, University of Washington, for research on the historical spread and development of Russian agriculture.

David Joravsky, Assistant Professor of History, Brown University, for research on the history of Michurinism (renewal of grant made in 1958-59).

George A. Lensen, Professor of History, Florida State University, for research on Russo-Japanese relations since 1875.

Roderick E. McGrew, Associate Professor of History, University of Missouri, for research on Russian social and political thought in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Albert Parry, Professor of Russian Studies, Colgate University, for research on the sociopolitical role of the Soviet Union's new scientists, engineers, and managers.

Hans Rogger, Associate Professor of History, Sarah Lawrence College, for research on nationalist and right-wing movements and parties in Russia, 1905-17.

Ivan L. Rudnytsky, Assistant Professor of History, La Salle College, for research on the history of Carpatho-Ukraine to 1921.

Nicolas Spulber, Associate Professor of Economics, Indiana University, for research on Soviet strategy and techniques of economic development.

Peter F. Sugar, Assistant Professor of History, University of Washington, for research on the 1790 Serb National Congress on Temesvar.

Howard R. Swearer, Lecturer on Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles, for research on local government and administration in the Soviet Union.

Glenn E. Torrey, Assistant Professor of Social Science, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, for research on German-Rumanian relations, 1914-18.

Valerie A. Tumins, Assistant Professor of Slavic Languages, Brown University, for research on Russian cultural relations with Western Europe in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.

Alexander Vucinich, Professor of Sociology, San Jose State College, for research on science in Russian culture (renewal of grant made in 1957-58).

## SUMMER RESEARCH TRAINING INSTITUTE ON ADMINISTRATION OF THE LAW OF TORTS

Selection of applicants for admission to the research training institute to be held at Dartmouth College, June 26–August 11, 1961, under the auspices of the Committee on Political Behavior, has been made by a subcommittee, consisting of Edward H. Levi (chairman), William M. Beaney, Harry Kalven, Jr., and Richard D. Schwartz. The following 14 persons have been invited to participate in the institute:

- Yehudi A. Cohen, Lecturer in Sociology, Columbia University
- Philip E. Davis, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, San Jose State College
- Robert E. Furlong, Assistant Professor of Law, Fordham University
- Edward Green, Professor of Sociology, Beaver College
- Milton Greenberg, Associate Professor of Political Science, Western Michigan University
- Heinz R. Hink, Associate Professor of Political Science, Arizona State University
- Donald P. Kommers, Assistant Professor of Government, Los Angeles State College
- Samuel Krislov, Associate Professor of Government, University of Oklahoma
- Colin R. Lovell, Professor of History, University of Southern California
- Albert A. Mavrinac, Professor of Government, Colby College
- Saul H. Mendlovitz, Associate Professor of Law, Rutgers University
- Jerome H. Skolnick, Assistant Professor of Sociology and Law, Yale University
- John W. Wade, Dean, Vanderbilt University School of Law
- W. J. Wagner, Associate Professor of Law, University of Notre Dame

## INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TRAVEL GRANTS

The Committee on International Conference Travel Grants—Leonard Krieger (acting chairman in the absence of Hugh L. Elsbree), G. Heberton Evans, Jr., Irwin T. Sanders, Fillmore Sanford, Edward H. Spicer, and S. S. Wilks—met on January 28. At this meeting and by mail votes, it has made 61 awards to assist social scientists resident in the United States to attend the following international congresses outside this country in 1961:

### *International Conference of Southeast Asian Historians, Singapore, January 16–20*

- J. Norman Parmer, Professor of History, Northern Illinois University
- Karl J. Pelzer, Professor of Geography, Yale University
- Paul Wheatley, Associate Professor of Geography, University of California, Berkeley
- Lea E. Williams, Associate Professor of Political Science, Brown University

### *International Congress of Applied Psychology, Copenhagen, August 13–19*

- Raymond A. Bauer, Professor of Business Administration, Harvard University
- Jack Block, Associate Professor of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley
- Jerome Cohen, Associate Professor of Neurology and Psychiatry (Psychology), Northwestern University
- Lee J. Cronbach, Professor of Education and Psychology, University of Illinois
- Henry P. David, Psychology Consultant, New Jersey State Department of Institutions and Agencies
- Anthony Davids, Associate Professor of Psychology, Brown University
- Joshua A. Fishman, Dean and Professor of Psychology, Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University
- Wilfred A. Gibson, Supervisory Research Psychologist, Adjutant General's Office, Department of the Army
- Robert Glaser, Professor of Psychology, University of Pittsburgh
- Leo Goldberger, Research Assistant Professor of Psychology, New York University
- Mason Haire, Professor of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley
- Starke R. Hathaway, Professor of Clinical Psychology, University of Minnesota Medical School
- Evelyn Hooker, Research Associate in Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles
- George Katona, Professor of Psychology and of Economics, University of Michigan
- George S. Klein, Professor of Psychology, New York University
- Nathan Kogan, Research Associate, Educational Testing Service
- Richard D. Lambert, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania
- Charles E. Osgood, Professor of Psychology, University of Illinois
- Donald G. Paterson, Emeritus Professor of Psychology, University of Minnesota, Consultant, Veterans Administration Hospital, Minneapolis
- Philburn Ratoosh, Visiting Associate Professor of Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley
- Irving Sarnoff, Professor of Social Work and Psychology, Western Reserve University
- Carroll L. Shartle, Professor of Psychology, Ohio State University
- Morris I. Stein, Professor of Psychology, New York University
- L. Joseph Stone, Professor of Child Study, Vassar College
- Arnold S. Tannenbaum, Program Director, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan
- Donald W. Taylor, Professor of Psychology, Yale University
- Albert S. Thompson, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University
- Harry C. Triandis, Assistant Professor of Psychology, University of Illinois
- Steven G. Vandenberg, Associate Professor of Child Development, University of Louisville Medical School

*International Statistical Institute, Paris,  
August 28 – September 7*

- Helen C. Farnsworth, Professor of Economics, Stanford University  
Leslie Kish, Professor of Sociology, University of Michigan  
Wassily W. Leontief, Professor of Economics, Harvard University  
Robert McGinnis, Associate Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin  
Marc Nerlove, Professor of Economics, Stanford University  
Ingram Olkin, Associate Professor of Statistics, University of Minnesota  
George L. Saiger, Associate Professor of Epidemiology, Columbia University School of Public Health and Administrative Medicine

*International Conference on Input-Output Techniques,  
Geneva, September 11–15*

- Anne P. Carter, Senior Research Associate in Economics, Harvard University  
Karl A. Fox, Professor of Economics and Sociology, Iowa State University  
Werner Z. Hirsch, Professor of Economics, Washington University  
Alan S. Manne, Associate Professor of Economics, Yale University

*World Congress of the International Political Science  
Association, Paris, September 26–30*

- Henry L. Bretton, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan  
Robert A. Dahl, Professor of Political Science, Yale University  
Gottfried Dietze, Associate Professor of Political Science, Johns Hopkins University  
David Easton, Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago  
Leon D. Epstein, Professor of Political Science, University of Wisconsin  
Herman Finer, Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago  
William T. R. Fox, Professor of International Relations, Columbia University

- Alexander Heard, Dean of the Graduate School and Professor of Political Science, University of North Carolina  
Samuel P. Huntington, Associate Professor of Government, Columbia University  
Charles S. Hyneman, Professor of Government, Indiana University  
Hans Kohn, Professor of History, The City College, New York  
Joseph LaPalombara, Professor of Political Science, Michigan State University  
Warren E. Miller, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan  
Richard L. Park, Associate Professor of Political Science, University of Michigan  
C. Herman Pritchett, Professor of Political Science, University of Chicago  
Warner R. Schilling, Assistant Professor of Government, Columbia University  
Clement E. Vose, Associate Professor of Government, Wesleyan University

*Other International Meetings*

In accordance with recommendations of the Committee on International Conference Travel Grants, the Council's Executive Committee has approved the award of travel grants to the following 5 scholars for attendance at the meetings indicated:

- Thomas C. Cochran, Professor of History, University of Pennsylvania; Meeting of the Commission on Economic History of the International Congress of Historical Sciences, Paris, March 23–24  
Charles F. Delzell, Associate Professor of Modern European History, Vanderbilt University; International Conference on the History of the Resistance, Milan, Italy, March 25–29  
Walter Gellhorn, Professor of Law, Columbia University; International Institute of Administrative Sciences, Round Table, Paris, September 11–15  
Franco Modigliani, Professor of Economics, Northwestern University; International Meeting of the Institute of Management Sciences, Brussels, August 23–26  
Percy H. Tannenbaum, Director, Mass Communications Research Center, University of Wisconsin; International Association for Mass Communication Research, Evian, France and Lausanne, Switzerland, June 22–26

## PUBLICATIONS

### COUNCIL PUBLICATIONS

*Labor Commitment and Social Change in Developing Areas*, edited by Wilbert E. Moore and Arnold S. Feldman. Sponsored by the Committee on Economic Growth. December 1960. 393 pages. Cloth, \$3.75.

*Theoretical Studies in Social Organization of the Prison*, Pamphlet 15, by Richard A. Cloward, Donald R. Cressey, George H. Grosser, Richard McCleery, Lloyd E. Ohlin, and Gresham M. Sykes and Sheldon L. Mesinger. Papers prepared by members of a Conference

Group on Correctional Organization, sponsored by the Council in 1956–57. March 1960. 152 pages. \$1.50.

*The State and Economic Growth: Papers of a Conference Held on October 11–13, 1956, under the Auspices of the Committee on Economic Growth*, edited by Hugh G. J. Aitken. May 1959. 399 pages. Cloth, \$3.75.

*Migration and Mental Disease: A Study of First Admissions to Hospitals for Mental Disease, New York, 1939–1941*, by Benjamin Malzberg and Everett S. Lee, with an introduction by Dorothy S. Thomas. Sponsored by



the former Committee on Migration Differentials. March 1956. 152 pages. \$1.50.

*Effects of Social and Cultural Systems in Reactions to Stress*, Pamphlet 14, by William Caudill. June 1958. 39 pages. 50 cents.

*Social Status and Public Health*, Pamphlet 13, by Ozzie G. Simmons. May 1958. 39 pages. 50 cents.

*Problems in Intercultural Health Programs*, Pamphlet 12, by George M. Foster. April 1958. 54 pages. 50 cents.

Special price for Pamphlets 12-14 together, \$1.00.

The publications of the Council are distributed from its office, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

#### OTHER BOOKS

*Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957*. Prepared by the Bureau of the Census, with the assistance of the former Advisory Committee on Historical Statistics. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, August 1960. 800 pages. Cloth, \$6.00.

*Theories of Economic Growth*, edited by Bert F. Hoselitz. Product of the Interuniversity Summer Research Seminar sponsored by the Committee on Economic Growth, 1956. Glencoe: Free Press, December 1960. 358 pages. Cloth, \$7.50.

#### CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION MONOGRAPHS

These monographs, sponsored by the former Committee on Cross-Cultural Education, are published by the University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis:

*Scandinavian Students on an American Campus*, by William H. Sewell and Oluf M. Davidsen. February 1961. 145 pages. Cloth, \$3.50.

*The Two-Way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Students' Adjustment*, by Richard T. Morris. July 1960. 229 pages. Cloth, \$4.50.

*In Search of Identity: The Japanese Overseas Scholar in America and Japan*, by John W. Bennett, Herbert Passin, and Robert K. McKnight. December 1958. 381 pages. Cloth, \$7.50.

*No Frontier to Learning: The Mexican Student in the United States*, by Ralph L. Beals and Norman D. Humphrey. August 1957. 159 pages. Cloth, \$3.25.

*Indian Students on an American Campus*, by Richard D. Lambert and Marvin Bressler. December 1956. 133 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

*The American Experience of Swedish Students*, by Franklin D. Scott. June 1956. 142 pages. Cloth, \$3.00.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

### FULBRIGHT GRANTS FOR ADVANCED RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY LECTURING IN THE PACIFIC AREA, SOUTH AND SOUTHEAST ASIA, AND LATIN AMERICA

The Committee on International Exchange of Persons, of the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, will issue early in April an announcement of United States Government awards available to American scholars under the Fulbright Act for advanced research and university lecturing during the academic year 1962-63 in the Pacific Area, South and Southeast Asia, and the Latin American Republics. Grants for 1962-63 are offered in the countries listed below, where the academic year is, in general, as indicated:

Pacific Area (March to November 1962): Australia and New Zealand

South and Southeast Asia (June 1962 to April 1963): Burma, Ceylon, India, Pakistan, Philippines, and Thailand

Latin America (March to November 1962): Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru, and Uruguay

*The closing date for making application will be May 1, 1961.*

The criteria of eligibility are: United States citizenship; for lecturing, at least one year of college or university teaching experience; for research, a doctoral degree or recognized professional standing; in some cases, a knowledge of the language of the host country.

The terms of award are as follows: Awards are tenable in one country, usually for a full academic year, and payable in the currency of the host country. They provide round-trip travel for the grantee, and to certain countries the travel of one dependent; a maintenance allowance to cover ordinary living expenses of the grantee and his family while in residence abroad; a small incidental allowance for internal travel, books, and services required by the assignment; for certain countries and within specific limitations, a supplemental dollar allowance.

Detailed information and application forms may be obtained from the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington 25, D.C.

## SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

*Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences*

*Directors, 1961:* GARDNER ACKLEY, PAUL BOHANNAN, JOHN A. CLAUSEN, HAROLD F. DORN, LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, CHAUNCEY D. HARRIS, H. FIELD HAVILAND, JR., PENDLETON HERRING, GEORGE H. HILDEBRAND, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, WAYNE H. HOLTZMAN, NATHAN KEYFITZ, LYLE H. LANIER, AVERY LEISERSON, EDWARD H. LEVI, PHILIP J. MCCARTHY, WILBERT E. MOORE, WILLIAM H. NICHOLLS, J. ROLAND PENNOCK, DAVID M. POTTER, NEVITT SANFORD, HERBERT A. SIMON, MELFORD E. SPIRO, DAVID B. TRUMAN, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., C. VANN WOODWARD, DONALD YOUNG, T. CUYLER YOUNG

*Officers and Staff:* PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; FRANCIS H. PALMER; ROWLAND L. MITCHELL, JR.; CATHERINE V. RONNAN, *Financial Secretary*

## ON SCIENCE AND THE POLITY

by Pendleton Herring \*

IN considering Science and the Polity the first point I would stress is their increasing intimacy. The advances made by science create problems that must be dealt with in their social implications by public policy. And as science reaches further into outer space or penetrates deeper into the nature of matter or probes toward the origin of life itself, we can anticipate more far-reaching consequences for society and therefore an even closer relationship between the affairs of state and those of research. The polity has a greater stake in the advancement of science than ever before and science receives more support from the state today than in all of history. It is clear that governmental and scientific affairs are joined, for better or worse; for better, the clearer the mutual understanding between the two and on the part of the rest of society.

My thesis is that scientific advancement and democratic government are intimately related, that indeed they spring from the same human impulses, rely on many of the same social conditions, and suffer from some of the same limitations. What interdependence can we see between the culture of science and that of a democratic society? What values are common to both science and a democratic polity? Science knows no authority but the idea, the thought, the theory that holds up under scrutiny, under testing, under the replication of experiment by different experimenters or under examination by different investigators. Democracy means an open society, the give and take of debate, a readiness

to experiment, to throw out one group and bring in another.

### THE COMMON CULTURE OF SCIENCE AND DEMOCRACY

Freedom of thought, trial and error, discarding theories or policies that have failed to work—this is the culture both of science and democracy. At the depth of the depression the nation responded to a call that may be taken as one expression of an elementary scientific attitude. Said President Roosevelt: "The country demands bold, persistent experimentation. It is common sense to take a method and try it: if it fails, admit it frankly and try another."<sup>1</sup> At this point of crisis the rallying cry was not to authority nor to tradition nor to old loyalties but to experimentation. Does not this attitude reflect a continuous strand in the pattern of American culture?

On the other hand, a weakness of a democratic system is a willingness to take the comfortable course, to encourage conformity, and to seek the common denominator. But this is alien to the whole ethos of science, to its ethical demands and dedicated pursuit of truth, to cutting through to the innermost secret, of weighing to the uttermost fraction, of letting no difficulty obtrude in the search for accuracy. The ideal of modern science, like that of the highest tradition of classic art, abhors half-way measures. Perhaps the discipline most appropriate to a free society is that firmly and happily self-imposed by the scientific worker, whatever his field or his studies.

\* This paper was given at the One Hundred Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Science, New York, December 27, 1960. The author was Vice President for its Section K, Social and Economic Sciences, during 1960.

<sup>1</sup> Quoted by Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Genius of American Politics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), p. 21.

Such dedication to higher standards lends strength to the whole society. Here is one important way in which the culture of science may contribute in its turn to strengthening that of democracy.

A democracy's potentiality is as great as the released intelligence of each individual member. In my view, the ultimate justification for democracy as a political process lies in its capacity to liberate the spirit of man and to insure freedom of thought to the end that there may be an optimum release of human intelligence.

The ethic that dictates democracy's concern for human dignity and individual worth as ends in themselves is fortified by the democratic ideal that welcomes and nurtures individual intelligence without regard to race, class, or creed.

## FUNCTIONS OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Science obviously can find no more congenial setting than an optimally functioning democracy. The function of science may be thought of as the release of energy—both in the most literal sense in modern physics and also in the myriad ways by which control of nature enhances human capacities. But science cannot be expected to determine the uses to which it is put. Science cannot decide policy. For most of the problems facing the politician or the administrator, scientific thought has no relevance. Science cannot be expected to solve society's problems unless such an expectation is based on a belief that the final answer, the definitive authority, the ultimate truth is scientific. This is a defensible philosophic position but in its premises remains an act of faith.

On the other hand, if we approach the role of science in operational or historical rather than in philosophical terms we see that science has provided not only much fundamental knowledge about the nature of the physical universe but also the means for dealing with a host of specific problems. The triumphs of the natural sciences, in order to be applied, have necessitated a division of labor. This organization of skills and resources has brought increased complexity in human and social arrangements. Take, for example, all that the advance of medical science demands in institutional forms (hospitals and laboratories), in professional training for medicine in all its branches, for nursing, hospital management, public health administration, etc. This is to mention but one example where social discipline and the rationally ordered use of human and economic resources are crucial.

Rather than to say that human engineering lags behind scientific advance, it would be more accurate to note that scientific knowledge is applied and fruitfully realized through technology only as organizational de-

vices and administrative skills make this possible. (And should we not add—as public policy directs and as political wisdom guides?)

The individual today functions as a member of a larger and more intricate complex of relationships than did his grandfather. If such a complex is to operate effectively each individual must properly perform his distinctive, even though limited, role. In a sequence of relationships where the success of the operation depends on smooth articulation and coordinated action, individual performance has more crucial consequences than in a simpler, less closely knit situation.

In organizational terms, dependence on the individual is greater and his personal responsibility proportionately higher. It seems to me, therefore, that science and technology enhance the importance of the individual. At the same time, for each individual to understand his social role and his operational function, a more rational attitude is required; a more self-conscious awareness is demanded than in a traditional society.

Those who satirize the "organization man" might more realistically compare his plight with that of the "tribal man" or the "feudal man" rather than with the individualism of a golden age that never existed. The individual can only express himself meaningfully within a coherent social setting. Organizational complexity need not threaten the integrity of the individual. It is the prevailing ethos that is significant. This means that, to fulfill his role, the citizen of a free polity needs to be aware of the consequences of his actions and beliefs. A concern with consequences, with attempts to anticipate, with prediction—this is the stuff of science.

The social sciences deal with distinctive ranges of circumstances and consequences, the natural sciences with other ranges. The whole scientific enterprise may indeed help the individual toward a fuller realization of the meaning of personal freedom, to wit, a capacity to foresee the probable consequences of one's actions. Cooperation is based on the individual's understanding of where he fits into the larger picture and of what his appropriate functions are as a member of the community and as a citizen. At times somewhat unrealistic views of the citizen's part in the formulation of public policy have been expressed. For example, it has been argued by the President's Science Advisory Committee that "A democratic citizenry today must understand science in order to have a wide and intelligent democratic participation in many national decisions." And the report notes the "urgency of providing high-grade and plentiful adult education in science now, planned for those who are unprepared even in the fundamentals."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Education for the Age of Science* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, May 24, 1959), p. 21.



The unreality of such exhortation, if taken *prima facie*, is patent. It reflects not only a lapse concerning the complexity of science but also a simplistic view of democratic government. This is not the place to embark upon a description of the governmental process in the United States; it may be sufficient to note that we do not make national decisions through a town meeting, and democratic participation would long since have failed were citizens required to have informed opinions on all the multifarious public issues of which science is only one.

In a word, there is a great deal that is purely hortatory in much of the discussion about the place of science in the polity and about the political role of the scientists. But if exhortation were subtracted from political discourse, what a meager sum would remain!

### NEED FOR SOCIAL SELF-KNOWLEDGE

I am not saying that the citizen must understand science or agriculture or banking or all the other substantive fields of public policy. This is obviously an impossible expectation. I am saying that the citizen needs to understand the nature of the political process and of the organizational complex of which he is a part, and that the social sciences are one important means of advancing this essential social self-knowledge. They provide the most articulate and systematic expression of this awareness. It follows then that a technologically advanced society must have an advanced social science if authoritarian controls are to be avoided.

My conclusion is not to urge as a solution to our problem either more civics courses for the citizen or more introductory science instruction for the layman. Such simple prescriptions have been offered many times. Obviously formal education for those disposed to learn is desirable. However, under conditions of freedom, required indoctrination into the meaning of science or the nature of the polity seems neither appropriate nor effective.

My view is that where both science and a democratic polity function in accord with their distinctive guiding values they create a culture that is mutually sustaining. Science and the polity must flourish together or each is endangered. The juncture of science and politics on such intimate and interdependent terms is new to our day. Of its significance we need to know much more than we do.

### A DISJUNCTURE OF SCIENCE AND SOCIETY?

I would like next to consider briefly some of the interesting current commentary that stresses the disjuncture

of science and society. Is science creating a chasm in the polity at the very time when mutual dependence is greatest? Some observers fear that science is too far removed from general public understanding. Others argue that scientists are unduly separated from other intellectuals.

In a brilliant article on modern science and the intellectual tradition, the physicist Gerald Holton reviews the place of science and finds that "the genuine acceptance of science as a valid part of culture is becoming less rather than more likely."<sup>3</sup> He analyzes the public image of science and stresses the view of the scientist as iconoclast and as the sorcerer's apprentice. The error and injustice of these fears are disposed of with compelling logic; yet I am inclined to think that this is effort spent in breaking down an open door.

A recent careful survey of a cross section of opinion reveals that scientists are viewed by the majority of the general public with respect. On topics that have received much publicity, such as the Salk vaccine, the average citizen is not seriously uninformed. Although, as always, the responses in an opinion survey are open to a variety of interpretations, there really seems to be no doubt of the broadly supportive public attitude. But what of the attitude of other intellectuals toward their scientific brethren? On this point Holton comes to a most arresting conclusion. He states: "By letting the intellectual remain in terrified ignorance about modern science, we have forced him into a position of tragic impotence; he is blindfold in a maze which he cannot decipher."<sup>4</sup>

This same theme, you may recall, has also been developed by C. P. Snow in his Rede Lecture on *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. It is Snow's thesis that a wide gulf exists between the world of science and that of literature, the humanities, and indeed much of the academic world. He sees: "Literary intellectuals at one pole—at the other scientists, and as the most representative, the physical scientists."<sup>5</sup>

I have no doubt that this polarity exists and also that a distorted image of science is held by some intellectuals and some nonintellectuals as well, but what does it amount to?

In assaying the social role of science, more significant than extremes of opinion is the nature of the middle ground between the poles. Our two witnesses are physicists (and also) widely read in the humanities. They are obviously well acquainted with the polar points in the debate. They are not, I think, sufficiently mindful of

<sup>3</sup> Gerald Holton, "Modern Science and the Intellectual Tradition," *The Intellectuals*, ed. George B. de Huszar (Glencoe: Free Press, 1960), p. 181.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 189.

<sup>5</sup> C. P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1959), p. 4.

the broad range of intervening viewpoints. Certainly to understand the relations of science and the polity we must look beyond both physics and literary criticism or popular misconceptions and public images of scientists. Here our topic begins to lose much of its drama. We note the routine activities of engineers of all kinds, of medical men and public health officials, and of the host of both technicians and scientific investigators who apply research to everyday needs. Although we can affirm that *science and the polity should be all of a piece*, there is no necessity, in my opinion, for insisting that the avant-garde in the arts or letters and the advance scouts on the scientific frontiers make common cause. Such conformity would weaken the relish of their prime pursuits.

But in the common pastures of academia the cleavages between the disciplines, whether in physical, life, or social sciences or in the arts and humanities, can and should be diminished. Now that public authorities are giving the natural sciences support that is their just due, the offer of a helping hand to those scholarly fields that enjoy less popular recognition might well be extended. Public policies broadening support to the higher learning generally, to education and research in all fields, will eradicate the divisions fostered among scholars by a sense of injustice and unfair discrimination. If basic research is to be supported by the government, what public agency is to declare one field of learning more basic than another?

As Holton has so eloquently written, "In the search for a new and sounder basis on which to build a stable world, science will be indispensable. We can hope to match the resources and structure of society to the needs and potentialities of people only if we know more about the inner working of man. Already science has much to say that is valuable and important about human relationships and problems."<sup>6</sup> And the social and behavioral sciences will have more and more to offer as basic research of high quality is fostered and opportunities for advanced training are increased.

## ROLE OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

But the pertinent point that I wish to stress here is the way these disciplines can contribute to a better understanding of the relations between science and the government and to the range of questions illustrated by the concerns of Messrs. Snow and Holton. The social sciences occupy a very strategic place in the intellectual spectrum, between the poles of physics and the arts and literature. Some social scientists feel closer to the natural sciences and others in some of the disciplines such as history find the humanities more congenial. Within the

<sup>6</sup> Holton, *op. cit.*, p. 186.

social sciences, as a prominent sociologist points out, "The study of politics is the meeting ground for many disciplines. Indeed, in the current study of political behavior, sociologists, psychologists, and anthropologists seem to play as central a role as traditional political scientists."<sup>7</sup>

In simpler times political philosophers provided interpretations concerning the individual's relationship to the state, but we got along without systematic efforts to analyze the operations of the polity through empirical research. Now answers must be sought through further research efforts to understand such phenomena as leadership and the nature of political power, its locus and operation; the political process and the interplay of groups; citizen participation and attitudes and opinions on public issues. The two later speakers on this program<sup>8</sup> will tell us of their research bearing on some of these topics: studies both methodologically rigorous and pertinent in substance.

The debate over the alienation of intellectuals from the scientific community or the cleavage that some observers see between both groups and the general public suggests that a well-designed opinion survey might be in order. Furthermore, the public role of scientists and the relationship of science and the polity might provide not only a fruitful topic for social science research by various disciplinary approaches but also serve to enlarge the common area of discourse between scientists and nonscientists. If the cleavage is as critical as feared, serious inquiry seems appropriate. (We do take the chance that further study, by introducing more pertinent facts, may dampen the ardor of an entertaining debate.)

Quite apart from public opinion with respect to science policy or popular misconceptions of technical fields or the attitudes of intellectuals toward scientists, there are institutional and historical factors that help to explain the role of scientists in government and the way in which they are regarded. One way to highlight such variables is to take a few of Snow's points and ask how his allegations hold up when examined in the light of American experience.

## SOCIAL SCIENCE AND THE CIVIL SERVICE: CONTRASTING EXPERIENCES

For example, a striking contrast with Great Britain is to be found in the relationship of science to the higher civil service. The traditional pattern in Britain has been

<sup>7</sup> Herbert Hyman, *Political Socialization* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1959), p. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Robert A. Dahl on "Bases of Local Political Influence in a Democracy," and Wallace S. Sayre on "Scientists and American Science Policy."

the recruitment of the administrative class from the outstanding college graduates frequently trained in the classics. In the United States the tradition of a classical education has never been as deeply rooted, nor is the specialization in scientific training undertaken so early. It is usually not until students embark upon their doctorate that their attention is focused solely on their specialty. Furthermore, the most basic civil service reform in the United States resulted from the necessity for officials highly trained, for example, in geology, chemistry, forestry, demography, statistics, economics, and engineering. The spoils system could not resist the necessity for staffing our federal bureaus with technically trained specialists. Scientists have been long established in the governmental bureaucracy and widely distributed throughout the federal service.

Snow at one point declares that the "academics had nothing to do with the industrial revolution."<sup>9</sup> This certainly cannot be said of the American educational system, with our long-time support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts. The history of our land-grant institutions reveals the close tie over the decades between many aspects of scientific advance and immediate application to the agricultural revolution, and our great engineering institutes and schools of business and commerce have kept in close touch with industry. Science has always been close to the workaday world in this country; indeed criticism has often been voiced of our undue emphasis upon applied research. Moreover, in recent debates about their appropriate role in the federal establishment, scientists have seen clearly that science is not something to be segregated in a special department. Scientific research bears a relationship to virtually all the major departments of government just as it bears on most segments of our national life. With respect to the United States I see no evidence that scientists are drawing apart; on the contrary, have they not learned to play the game of politics with skill and effectiveness?

"Non-scientists," Snow insists, "have a rooted impression that the scientists are shallowly optimistic, unaware of man's condition."<sup>10</sup> It is hard to think of evidence to sustain such a view for the United States. It is patently inapplicable when one recalls the public image represented by figures such as Detlev Bronk, Vannevar Bush, James Conant, James Killian, Isador Rabi, and Warren Weaver—to mention just a few of those whose names spring to mind. Or consider the attitude typified by the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. The leaders from the fields of science who have come to the fore during the last two decades have revealed not only their ability

to advance scientific matters but also great capacity for seeing scientific developments in relation to national strength and welfare.

## RELATION OF SCIENTISTS

### AND NONSCIENTISTS

I doubt that the relation of scientists to nonscientists will ever be resolved by closer intellectual understanding between so-called cultures. Ours is a society of many cultures in Snow's sense of the term because it is a pluralistic society. All elite groups in a democracy suffer on occasion from a lack of sympathetic understanding—paradoxically this may be the democratic way of expressing deference to those with power and influence. Bankers and leaders of big business can compare their well-healed scars with those of labor leaders and city bosses. Now natural scientists and social scientists alike can nurse their newly acquired bruises and realize ruefully that they too have won recognition and prestige.

Science will have its well-wishers and its ill-wishers just as management, labor, agriculture and all the other great forces in American life have friends and adversaries. But science, like education and health, really need fear no enemies. Rather it must learn to live with tepid supporters who are happy to enjoy its benefits but chronically unenthusiastic about paying for all they enjoy. By comparison, historically, with other potent emergent elements in American life, science enjoys an unusually favorable climate of opinion: its achievements and its further promises are both profoundly disturbing and highly inspiring; yet its impact has not been politically divisive.

In a democratic polity powerful new tendencies in the society seek and find political expression. Before World War I when the changing position of the United States in world affairs demanded a new posture on the part of the federal government to deal with newly emerged economic and political forces, both domestic and international, Woodrow Wilson came to leadership with his conception of the New Freedom. In the opinion of one perceptive historian: "The spectacle of a professor of political science in the chair of the President of the United States was a symptom of these new tendencies in American life."<sup>11</sup> Herbert Hoover as President came of that generation of engineers who likewise won recognition as top executives in industry. Modern science has arisen as a new force in American life of such strength, magnitude, and acceleration that its full portent cannot yet be clearly envisaged. Can we not expect to see a statesman elected to the Presidency within the not too distant future from among leaders in the natural sci-

<sup>9</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 25.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.

<sup>11</sup> Boorstin, *op. cit.*, p. 165.



ences? At the very least, it is entirely reasonable to suppose that the capacity of a presidential candidate to deal intelligently with scientists, scientific advisers, and policies heavily involving science will become a matter of increasing public concern.

#### SUMMARY

To summarize: Insofar as the United States is concerned, science and the polity are not estranged if we take into account the role of scientists in public affairs. The enhanced role of the scientist means that he is being called upon to advise on public policy and to carry out duties of governance. Engineers, bankers, and industrialists are other specialist elite groups who in recent decades have been called upon to assume political functions. The most notable failures were those who were unaware that their new role made distinctive demands.

The scientist because of his new political importance has a greater obligation to know about the polity than do nonscientists to know about science. Science has become another of the great interest groups and in a free society has assumed a prominent place in the polity. But science is more than an interest group. It is a way of thinking, of behaving, and of evaluating.

Why has so little been done to study a subject so interesting and important? The answer is that a few research efforts have been attempted but that the subject

matter is very elusive. Nor has anything like adequate attention been given to science as a social phenomenon and to its relation to the rest of society. The task is still waiting to be done. A leading sociologist or two have recognized the need; a few historians of science are now at work. Political scientists have given only the most preliminary attention to the matter. High on the agenda for political science for the next decade should be research into those conditions which will enable both democracy and science to take root and grow in the presently underdeveloped areas of the world—in Asia, Africa, or Latin America.

We face a scientific revolution in a world of many cultures. We have hardly begun to visualize the magnitude of the problems and the plenitude of benefits that can ensue if research in terms of both science and the polity are advanced together. To realize this goal will call both for high scientific ability and for a capacity to understand the realities of political life and the structure of power in a diversity of nation-states.

If science is to be fruitful in human terms it must play a sustaining role in the development of free polities in a variety of cultures over the world. The present "cultural divisions" here at home among intellectuals and academic specialists will then seem slight indeed as the common assault on ignorance and indifference is joined by thinking men in many nations.

